



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,536	03/03/2004	Lin Shiue Lian	8961-000010/US	3361
30593 7590 03/07/2007 HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195			EXAMINER BERTOGLIO, VALARIE E	
			ART UNIT 1632	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/791,536

Applicant(s)

LIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Valarie Bertoglio

Art Unit

1632

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Valarie Bertoglio*  
*AV 1632*

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 1 and 23 raise new issues for consideration under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. The term "systemically" in claim 1 is unclear. It is unclear what is being claimed in claim 23. The claim reads "prepared from the transgenic progeny" of claim 1. It is not clear if the fish from either step (b) or (c) must be mated to obtain that claimed in claim 23 or if it is referring to the transgenic progeny of step (b) or to the selected transgenic progeny of step (c). The amendment to claim 17 raises issues of new matter because support for "egg-laying toothcarps" is not found in the specification. .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claim amendments have not been entered and therefore fail to overcome any of the rejections set forth in the office action dated 12/19/2006. Applicant's remarks regarding the rejections under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs rely on the proposed claim amendments. Applicant argues with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 102(b) that neither Lawson nor Fadool taught systemic expression. The proposed amendment introducing the term "systemic" into claim 1 has not been entered, rendering moot Applicant's argument. However, it is noted, that the term "systemic" is not defined and there is nothing on the record to indicate that the term requires expression in each and every cell and each and every tissue as indicated in Applicant's Remarks. The specification sets forth that the alpha-actin promoter causes systemic expression. This promoter drives expression in a single tissue, muscle. Thus, absent a definition of "systemic", if a promoter expressing in muscle tissue is considered in the specification to be "systemic", it would appear that other promoters that express in a single tissue would also be considered "systemic". Furthermore, it is noted that such a narrow definition as indicated by Applicant's remarks may cause issues under enablement as the specification fails to set forth promoters that would cause such "systemic" expression. It is also noted that the intended use as an ornamental fish is not relevant or persuasive in overcoming the rejections.